

10/022,805

**REMARKS**

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is made obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

**I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 22, 24-35 AND 37-47 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 22, 24-35 and 37-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being made obvious by the Mahany patent (United States Patent No. 5,960,344, issued on September 28, 1999, hereinafter "Mahany") in view of the Keane patent (United States Patent No. 7,085,854, issued August 1, 2006, hereinafter "Keane") and further in view of the Brownrigg et al. patent application (United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0062224, published April 1, 2004, hereinafter "Brownrigg"). In response the Applicants have amended independent claims 22 and 35, from which claims 24-34 and 37-47 depend, in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

In particular, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the fact that Mahany, Keane, and Brownrigg, singly or in any permissible combination, fail to teach, show or suggest the use of a first type of communication medium (*i.e.*, a point-to-point medium in the Applicants' claims) to configure the use of a second, different type of communication medium (*i.e.*, a shared medium in the Applicants' claims), as recited by the Applicants' independent claims 22 and 35.

By contrast, Mahany, Keane, and Brownrigg all teach the use of a single type of communication medium. For instance, Mahany teaches the use of radio frequency (RF) transmissions for all communications with the wireless access point ("The radios and antennas are used for RF transmission and reception," Mahany, column 4, lines 53-54). Keane teaches establishing tunnels between two gateways via tunnels to an intermediary/control system ("...a first gateway ... may establish ... a first encrypted information flow to the control system"; "... a second gateway ... may establish ... a second encrypted information flow to the control system"; "The control system may also

10/022,805

enable a third encrypted information flow ... between the first gateway and the second gateway," Keane, column 13, lines 20-42). Brownrigg teaches communications between clients and a server using radio transmissions ("The client process of each of the clients initiates, selects, and maintains a radio transmission path to the server that is either a direct path to the server, or is an indirect path or 'link' to the server through at least one of the remainder of the clients," Brownrigg, Abstract). In none of Mahany, Keane, or Brownrigg is it suggested that a communication over one type of communication medium is configured or set up using another, different type of communication medium, as claimed by the Applicants in independent claims 22 and 35.

Specifically, Applicants' independent claims 22 and 35, as amended, recite:

22. A method for managing communications over a plurality of networked devices, the method comprising:

exchanging a first directed, one to one communication between a first networked device and a second networked device over a secure communication channel established between said first networked device and said second networked device using a first type of communication medium, the first type of communication medium being a point-to-point medium; and

configuring, via said secure communication channel, a use of a second type of communication medium, different from said first type of communication medium, by at least said second networked device, the second type of communication medium being a shared medium, wherein said configuring enables said second networked device to broadcast messages to a third networked device over said shared medium in a manner that allows said messages to be heard by other networked devices within range of said second networked device and said third networked device.

35. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the steps of a method for managing communications over a plurality of networked devices, the method comprising:

exchanging a first directed, one to one communication between a first networked device and a second networked device over a secure communication channel established between said first networked device and said second networked device using a first type of communication medium, the first type of communication medium being a point-to-point medium; and

configuring, via said secure communication channel, a use of a second type of communication medium, different from said first type of communication

10/022,805

medium, by at least said second networked device, the second type of communication medium being a shared medium, wherein said configuring enables said second networked device to broadcast messages to a third networked device over said shared medium in a manner that allows said messages to be heard by other networked devices within range of said second networked device and said third networked device.

As discussed above, the Applicants' independent claims 22 and 35 clearly recite exchanging a communication over a first type of communication medium (*i.e.*, a point-to-point medium) in order to configure the use of a second, different type of communication medium (*i.e.*, a shared medium). This allows, for example, a teacher to "beam" a contract to a specific student using a point-to-point medium, where the beamed contract allows the student to use a shared medium, for example for communications with another student or with a classroom resource. As further discussed above, none of Mahany, Keane, and Brownrigg teaches these limitations. Therefore, the Applicants submit that independent claims 22 and 35 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

Dependent claims 24-34 and 37-47 depend, respectively, from claims 22 and 35 and recite additional features therefore. As such, and for at least the same reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that claims 24-34 and 37-47 are not made obvious by the teachings of Mahany in view of Keane and further in view of Brownrigg. Therefore, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 24-34 and 37-47 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

## **II. CONCLUSION**

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of the presented claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all of the presented claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.


If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so

10/022,805

that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

2/28/08  
Date

  
Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,400  
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702